

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed January 14, 2010, the Assignee respectfully requests reconsideration. To further the prosecution of this application, each of the objections and rejections set forth in the Office Action has been carefully considered and is addressed below. The application as presented is believed to be in allowable condition.

I. **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-8, 13, 14 and 17 (including independent claims 1, 2, and 7) under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as purportedly being obvious over International Application No. WO 01/31634 ("Mishelevich") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,314,397 ("Lewis"). In view of the amendments herein, the Assignee respectfully requests reconsideration

A. **Overview of Some Embodiments**

Speech recognition and correction systems operate to transcribe spoken text into recognized text and some systems recognize and correct errors within words and word sequences during transcription (Specification, page 1, lines 15-17). Applicants have recognized that such systems may be improved by storing a lexicon of alternatives on a correction device, such that the correction of texts recognized by a speech recognition system can be carried out in a more simple and rapid manner (Specification, page 3, lines 32-34). Entries in the lexicon of alternatives are created at least in part from sources of knowledge that are independent from the transcription by the speech recognition device (Specification, page 4, lines 5-8). Furthermore, the contents of at least some of the entries in the lexicon of alternatives are updated based on at least one previous correction made by the correction device (Specification, page 6, lines 5-7). For example, the number of times that a text element is replaced by another element, or the phonetic similarity of a text element and its replacement during a previous correction may be used to update the contents of one or more entries in the lexicon of alternatives (Specification, page 10, lines 8-24).

The foregoing summary is provided to assist the Examiner in appreciating some applications for various aspects of the invention. However, this summary may not apply to each of the independent claims, and the language of the independent claims may differ in material respects from

the summary provided above. Thus, the Assignee respectfully requests that careful consideration be given to the language of each of the independent claims and that each be addressed on its own merits, without relying on the summary provided above. In this respect, the Assignee does not rely on the summary provided above to distinguish any of the claims over the prior art. Rather, the Assignee relies only upon the arguments provided below.

B. The Purported Combination of Mishelevich and Lewis Fails to Disclose or Suggest
All Limitations of Any of Independent Claims 1, 2, and 7

i. *Independent Claim 1*

Amended claim 1 includes a limitation that recites, “...wherein the correction device comprises a lexicon of alternatives, the lexicon of alternatives comprising a plurality of entries, at least some of which are displayed by the correction device as a list of alternatives to individual word parts, words and/or word sequences of the recognized text, **wherein the list of alternatives for at least some of the plurality of entries in the lexicon of alternatives displayed for a particular individual word part, word, and/or word sequence is updated based, at least in part, on a number of times that the correction device previously corrected the particular individual word part, word, and/or word sequence** (emphasis added).” Support for this amendment is found at least at page 10, lines 8-18 of the specification. Neither Mishelevich nor Lewis discloses or suggests the above-highlighted limitation of claim 1.

The Office Action concedes that Mishelevich fails to disclose that the list of alternatives...is updated based on information about at least one previous correction made by the correction device for the particular individual word, but asserts that col. 6, lines 16-24 of Lewis discloses this limitation (Office Action, page 4). The cited portion of Lewis is directed to adding a previously corrected word or replacement text to a correction dialog box list of alternate words (Lewis, col. 6, lines 16-24). However, although this portion of Lewis is directed to updating a list of alternate words using information from a previous correction (e.g., by adding a previously selected word to the list), neither the cited portion of Lewis nor any other portion of Lewis discloses or suggests updating a list of alternative based, at least in part, **on a number of times that the correction device previously corrected a particular individual word part, word, and/or word sequence**, as recited in

amended claim 1. Rather, as discussed above, the only reference in Lewis to updating a list of alternatives relates to adding a previously selected word to the list, and the updating is not based, at least in part, on a number of times that a correction device previously corrected a particular individual word part, word, and/or word sequence.

For at least this reason, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the combination of Mishelevich and Lewis and it is respectfully requested that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn.

ii. Independent Claim 2

Amended claim 2 is directed to a correction device and recites, “...a storage device configured to store a lexicon of alternatives comprising a plurality of entries, at least some of which are displayed by the correction device as a list of alternatives to individual word parts, words and/or word sequences of the recognized text, wherein the list of alternatives for at least some of the plurality of entries in the lexicon of alternatives displayed for a particular individual word part, word, and/or word sequence are updated based, at least in part, on information about at least one previous correction made by the correction device for the particular individual word part, word, and/or word sequence, **wherein the list of alternatives is updated only when at least a predetermined degree of phonetic similarity exists between the particular individual word part, word, and/or word sequence and a text replacement in the at least one previous correction** (emphasis added).” Support for this amendment is found at least at page 10, lines 19-24 of the specification.

As should be appreciated from the foregoing, claim 2 patentably distinguishes over the combination of Mishelevich and Lewis because neither Mishelevich nor Lewis discloses updating a list of alternatives for at least some of the plurality of entries in a lexicon of alternatives based, at least in part, on information about at least one previous correction, wherein the list of alternatives is updated only when at least a predetermined degree of phonetic similarity exists between the particular individual word part, word, and/or word sequence and a text replacement in the at least one previous correction, as recited in amended claim 2. In particular, Mishelevich does not disclose

or suggest updating a list of alternatives based on a previous correction and the only reference in Lewis to updating a list of alternatives relates to adding a previously selected word to the list.

For at least this reason, claim 2 patentably distinguishes over Mishelevich and Lewis and it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn. Claims 3-6 depend from claim 2 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

iii. Independent Claim 7

Amended claim 7 recites, “...including the text elements that can be confused with one another as a list of alternatives in the entry of the lexicon of alternatives; **wherein the list of alternatives in the entry is updated based, at least in part, on whether a frequency of at least one previous correction of the recognized text is within predetermined bounds** (emphasis added).” Support for this amendment is found at least at page 10, lines 8-18 of the specification.

As should be appreciated from the foregoing, neither Mishelevich nor Lewis discloses a list of alternatives that is updated based, at least in part, on whether a frequency of at least one previous correction of the recognized text is within predetermined bounds, as required by amended claim 7. Accordingly, claim 7 patentably distinguishes over the combination of Mishelevich and Lewis and it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn. Claims 8-17 depend from claim 7 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

II. General Comments on Dependent Claims

Since each of the dependent claims depends from a base claim that is believed to be in condition for allowance, for the sake of brevity, the Assignee believes that it is unnecessary at this time to argue the further distinguishing features of the dependent claims. However, the Assignee does not necessarily concur with the interpretation of the previously presented dependent claims as set forth in the Office Action, nor does the Assignee concur that the basis for rejection of any of the previously presented dependent claims is proper. Therefore, the Assignee reserves the right to specifically address the further patentability of the dependent claims in the future.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, the Assignee believes the pending application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if this communication does not place the case in condition for allowance.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, the Assignee hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, the Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment in the fees filed, asserted to be filed, or which should have been filed herewith to our Deposit Account No. 23/2825, under Docket No. N0484.70060US00 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: April 14, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

Nuance Communications, Inc.

By _____


Daniel T. Wehner, Reg. No.: 63,480
Richard F. Giunta, Reg. No.: 36,149
WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.
Federal Reserve Plaza
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206
617.646.8000